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Introduction

• The environmental impact of aviation is enormous given the fact that in the US alone there are nearly 6 million flights per year of commercial aircraft.

• This situation has driven numerous policy and procedural measures to help develop environmentally friendly technologies which are safe and affordable and reduce the environmental impact of aviation.

• Many technologies require significant capital investment and retrofits which are long and costly enterprises.
Fuel consumption per seat has declined dramatically.

We estimate that a single Boeing 747 can emit as much as 457,000 kg of carbon dioxide into the high atmosphere during a long range flight.
State of the art

- **Fuel bias number**: compare the total fuel consumed by a flight against an average value based on historical data.
- Drawback: Does not account for context of the flight over its course - weather, wind speed, payload etc.
- Subtle performance issues not revealed.

Is a high fuel usage on a specific flight significant or not given the observed data?
Which aircraft burns more fuel?

Fuel Consumption as a function of Tail Number for about 20K flights

Each color band is one tail number
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Which aircraft burns more fuel?

Output of Virtual Sensors as a function of Tail Number for about 20K flights.

Larger output means stronger anomaly.

Each color band is one tail number.
A novel method based on *Virtual Sensors* to detect an anomaly in the consumption of fuel in modern aircraft using data that is already measured and monitored.
Fuel Consumption Model

\[ h_t = I(h_{t-1}^*) \]
\[ x_t = \Psi(x_{t-1}^*, h_t^*, u_t, c) \]
\[ y_t = \Omega(x_t) + \epsilon_t \]

- **h**: hidden state of the aircraft
- **x**: observed system state from FOQA data
- **u**: pilot input
- **c**: context of flight (weather etc.)
- **y**: fuel burned at time t
- **epsilon**: measurement noise
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Virtual Sensors Algorithm

Algorithm 1: Virtual Sensors for Anomaly Detection

Input: \((X, Y, C, \alpha, m, n)\), representing state variables, the target variable, the cost function for minimization, a multiplier on the number of standard deviations to use as the anomaly detection threshold, the number of models, the number of bootstrap samples, respectively.

Output: Sorted list of anomalies List

Initialization: Standardize inputs and outputs to have zero mean and unit variance;
begin

for \(k = 1\) to \(m\) do

  Draw bootstrap replicate with \(n\) samples: \((X_k', Y_k')\)

  minimize cost function \(C\) to obtain estimate: \(\hat{Y}_k = G(X_k', \theta_k)\);

  Compute mean and standard deviation of the estimates for the \(m\) models;

  Compute the percentage of the test data for a given flight that is larger than the mean + \(\alpha\) standard deviations;

  Return rank ordered list List of anomalous flights.

Building Virtual Sensors

Training Phase

• **Build** nominal fuel consumption model as a function of aircraft state
• Use **Flight Operational Quality Assurance** (FOQA) data
• Use state-of-the-art, robust ensemble regression techniques to **predict** instantaneous fuel consumption.

Testing Phase

• Use model to **predict** instantaneous fuel consumption as a function of aircraft state
• If **true fuel consumption** is much higher than **predicted fuel consumption** we note an anomaly
• Flights with **large number** of such instants classified as anomalous
Virtual Sensors discover anomalies that are not detected by traditional measures.

![Graphs showing normalized fuel consumption and time of fuel exceedance.](image)
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### Output of Virtual Sensors Algorithm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tail Number*</th>
<th>% High</th>
<th>% Low</th>
<th>% OK</th>
<th># of Flights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>39.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.20</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.98</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>89.99</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90.52</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.60</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>92.39</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>93.07</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.02</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.42</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>95.76</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>96.01</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>96.80</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*anonymized
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Nominal flight – actual fuel consumption falls within prediction bounds

% anomalous: 5.2667%; average fuel consumption relative to city pair: 1.0279

True fuel consumption
Predicted consumption
True average (city pair) fuel consumption
Predicted average (city pair) fuel consumption
Nominal flight - fuel consumption falls within prediction bounds

% anomalous: 0.066667%; average fuel consumption relative to city pair: 1.0842
Anomalous flight - fuel consumption falls above prediction bounds.

True fuel consumption higher than average city pair fuel consumption

This anomaly may be detected using traditional methods since the actual fuel used is more than the average for the city pair.
Anomalous flight - fuel consumption falls above prediction bounds

True fuel consumption lower than average city pair fuel consumption

This anomaly would not be detected using traditional methods since the actual fuel used is less than the average for the city pair.
Anomalous flight - fuel consumption falls above prediction bounds

% anomalous: 21.9333%; average fuel consumption relative to city pair: 0.96077

True fuel consumption lower than average city pair fuel consumption

This anomaly would not be detected using traditional methods since the actual fuel used is less than the average for the city pair.
Impact

• Perhaps the first technology to detect fuel consumption anomalies as a function of aircraft state
• Findings may be used to take timely, corrective maintenance measures on fleet
• Under significant testing at Southwest Airlines today with strong support from the carrier.
VS can Discover Trends over Time

![Graph showing anomalous tail number 1002 with predicted fuel consumption, measured fuel consumption, and prediction confidence bounds.](image)
Discussion

- Fuel overconsumption may occur even if a flight uses less fuel than expected based on average city pair usage.
- A flight can be classified as **nominal** even though it consumes **more** fuel than average for a city pair.
- A flight can be classified as **anomalous** even though it consumes **less** fuel than average for a city pair.
- Virtual Sensors can explain about 90% of the variance in fuel consumption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>stableGP</th>
<th>GLM</th>
<th>nnet</th>
<th>gp</th>
<th>time-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% high</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>2.514</td>
<td>2.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% low</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>1.003</td>
<td>6.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% ok</td>
<td>99.998</td>
<td>99.875</td>
<td>99.989</td>
<td>96.483</td>
<td>91.553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRMSE</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.208</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milestones achieved

• TA1: Build Virtual Sensors (VS) using at least 100K flights
  – Southwest: 60K flights; EasyJet: 200K flights
• TA2: Build VS system with automatic regularization
  – Identifies key factors that drive fuel consumption
• TA3: Tested VS system built in TA1 and 2 on real-world operational data
  – Conducted numerous statistical tests to determine quality of results
  – Tested on other benchmark data sets
• TA4: Published one journal paper, submitted to AIAA Infotech, in preparation for CIDU
  – A. N. Srivastava, “Greener Aviation through Virtual Sensors: A Case Study, Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, Volume 24 Issue 2, March 2012, Impact factor 2.16
Dissemination

- Virtual Sensors technology is open sourced
- Published in a top journal in the field of data mining:
- Under review at AIAA Infotech
- In preparation for Conference for Intelligent Data Understanding (in preparation)
Summary and Future Work

Summary

• Fuel consumption depends on state of aircraft (FOQA)
• Anomalous behavior should be determined relative to state of the aircraft
• Existing studies do not take this into account
• Proposed fuel study technique a novel effort in this direction
• Promising initial results for determining statistical anomalies

Future Work

• Improve the quality of fuel consumption model by leveraging new results in ensemble learning, robust convex optimization
• Further validation of results with Southwest Airlines.
• Determine whether the anomalies are actually operating in an off-nominal condition.
• Assess actionability and recommend best practices.
APPENDIX
Anomalous flight - fuel consumption lower than average city pair fuel consumption.